

MAYFIELD/HP COMMUNITY MEETING  
July 14, 2004

COMMENTS FROM SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Four main Issues in each small group discussion:

1. Circulation Network:  
(pedestrian, bikes and automobiles)
2. Variety of Housing Types  
(Location, and Edge Treatment)
3. Parks and Open Space  
(Public & Private)
4. Other Potential Land Uses?  
(Shops & Services, Grocery Store, Day Care)

Table No. 4.

- Concern about traffic both within Mayfield site and in greater area, and spillover into neighborhood.
- Concern about traffic on Whitney Drive, San Antonio
- Concern about speed control
- Bike and pedestrian accessibility
- Availability and access to public transportation
- Make sure there is enough guest parking so that it does not spill over into neighborhood
- Prefer larger parks
- Approximately half of the group would prefer to retain the existing site as commercial
- NO RETAIL – concern about businesses such as liquor stores
- Want to ensure that there is coordination with Palo Alto
- Concern about crime and drug use, particularly as green areas(parks) relate to the neighborhood
- Prefer lower densities, higher average sales price to create higher values for adjacent neighborhood.
- Prefer built in parking (not large open parking lots)
- Development should be “architecturally relevant” to area

Table 5:

- Plans shown should include a legend

- Should be sensitive to heights near existing homes
- Prefer single Family Homes – using same lot-sizes as those adjacent
- 600-800 units seems impossible – too much traffic
- There are already 70 units of low income housing going on Alvin Street – that’s enough, we have done our bit [Staff correction—these proposed units are market-rate, not low income]
- Concerns about cut-through traffic on Nita and Mayfield Avenues
- Traffic: Concerns about bottleneck at San Antonio, kids crossing streets, etc. unsafe
- Traffic around Caltrain Crossing
- Don’t want any straight through roads – concerns about speeding
- Don’t want “gratuitous red zones” in new development that will result in spillover parking into existing neighborhood
- Should have adequate parking for schools and parks
- May need extra school for all these extra units
- There are limits to what a neighborhood can absorb
- Reference to the Mountain View Voice article: there is a need for a practice field for Baseball & Soccer. This would indicate one large park.
- Save the trees
- Park as a transition between the new development and existing neighborhood
- Community garden
- NO Retail – there are already several grocery stores nearby
- Caltrain parking required
- Daycare might be of interest
- Parking concern – there may not be enough parking for the parks
- Hope staff will listen to neighborhood as much as they are listening to Toll Brothers
- Want to come back for another meeting, make sure proposed development has same character as existing neighborhood
- Need a larger venue for this kind of meeting
- Housing would be OK on the Mayfield site if it has the same lot sizes as those in the existing neighborhood

**Table 1:**

- Walking paths desirable
- Curved road preferred over linear roads to prevent cut-through traffic
- Don’t like plans with relocation of Nita Avenue at San Antonio because of cut-through traffic
- Traffic Calming: raised crosswalks, roundabouts at intersections
- Would like to see a pedestrian crossing at San Antonio Avenue

- There is not enough room on the site to accommodate parking at 2.3 spaces/unit. Concern that there will be spillover parking into existing neighborhood.
- Matching housing types to the existing houses adjacent
- Sidewalks are important
- Single stories between new and existing development is preferred. No more than 2 stories
- More affordable Housing
- Only Single Family
- Site Lines are critical and should be drawn from other streets as well as Betlo Avenue (as was shown in the presentation)
- Max. 3-4 stories across site
- Consider housing for different demographics, such as housing for Seniors + low income groups
- GREEN BUILDING DESIGN
- Buffer park at perimeter
- Walking paths
- Fewer but larger parks desirable
- More than 3 acres of park needed. 3 acres should be considered the minimum.
- Less hard-scape, More green-scape
- Pool and Clubhouse facilities should be accessible to everyone including the Monta Loma neighborhood
- Save ALL mature trees
- Community Garden
- Pedestrian malls instead of through traffic streets
- Large parks produce noise
- If there is not a pool, the space should be used for a park instead

#### Land uses:

- Caltrain parking required
- Approximately half of the group prefers the use to remain as is
- No grocery
- Day care or specialty retail good, but no chains
- Some would like to see a 27 acre park with a recreation center

#### Table 2:

- Bike and pedestrian access OK through Whitney Avenue, with access to Palo Alto
- Style of housing should be integrated with existing neighborhood
- NO – Gated Communities
- Would like to see examples of mid- to high-density housing. Not sure what this looks like.

- NO – Retail
- NO – Daycare. Already well-served with Cubberley
- Put higher density on main roads – San Antonio and Central Expressway
- Pedestrian cross-access over Central Expy, San Antonio
- Want park space but group could not agree on park size
- Relationship between Mountain View and Palo Alto should be smooth and seamless
- Concern about whether there is enough school capacity for the extra housing

Table 3:

- Preference for meandering streets to control traffic
- No speed bumps
- No straight roads
- No more underpasses
- Maintain access for bicycles with cycling paths, street crossings
- Prefer SINGLE FAMILY, less density
- A mix of housing types, whether affordable or not
- Site cannot solve the housing problem in California
- 3 stories acceptable towards the interior of the site (up to 35 ft. with setbacks and/or gables towards the top)
- No affordable Housing
- Want an appropriate 'architectural look' NOT like Crossings – don't want boring, monolithic, gray cinderblock architecture
- Same lot-sizes as existing, with back yards
- Keep TREES
- Heights should be lower along the entire periphery of the site, including behind Aldean Avenue
- Parks – should be 'big and usable - sized to a particular sport rather than sized arbitrarily
- Use linear park as a buffer between new and existing development
- Preserve existing trees – there are some beautiful redwoods on the site. Plant the trees in the new parks
- Put highest densities in the middle of the site, and shelter with parks and trees
- Make whole site a park
- Caltrain parking required
- Reuse the building/complex that we have already got? Perhaps it can be used as professional space
- NO – grocery store
- Could be a high-tech incubator, given the Silicon Valley location
- Could be a wildlife rescue center
- Could have a post office

- Concern that no amount of parking would ever be adequate
- Should have all of this meeting material online
- This meeting is too rushed – people need time to digest the material. Would like more meetings.
- What is Palo Alto's influence?
- Question about the relevance of the meeting feedback and how it will be used

#### Table 7:

- Keep curved access road – curved access is less inviting for cut-through traffic
- Encourage Pedestrian and Bike use in the new neighborhood

#### Land Use:

- Keep similar land uses as existing, or have Single Family Homes
- There should be an impact study on the effect of different land uses on the property values
- The architecture shown in the presentation doesn't fit with the neighborhood's Eichler and Macay homes
- Don't want "cookie-cutter" design, glued-on trim, etc. – want actual architecture
- Green Building Design
- Variety in housing design
- More parks are good
- Keep all the TREES as much as possible
- Pool not of interest if existing neighborhood can't use it
- Concern about developer being able to "buy down the park requirement", and whether the fee is appropriate for the value of the landscaping and open space
- No big-box retail, maybe daycare OK
- Shade required for parks, parking areas.

#### Table 6:

- There is a girls' middle school in the area looking for a site. Perhaps the site should be used for a new girls' middle school
- Concern about heights of houses
- What about more parking requirements?
- Underpass access needed to train to relieve congestion
- Drop-by traffic for Caltrain Station – needs resolution
- 800 homes would correspond to 1600 cars – this is too much

- Concern about heights of houses bordering existing neighborhood
- Safe bike access to Palo Alto desirable
- Curved access to Whitney Drive Preferred. Concern straight alignment would invite same problems as on Thompson Avenue
- Visitor parking required, especially for parks
- Monta Loma currently is built at 6 units/acre. Concern that additional density would mean more cars and additional impacts on schools
- Would forego parks for lower densities
- Housing should be for workers who work in Mountain View
- Lower densities preferred
- Should decide what types of people we would like living here, and find ways to encourage that through the types of housing built
- Don't think retail will work
- Concern for cut-through traffic
- Other potential land uses: day care , preschool, office, or high-end retirement
- Community facility
- Should think about the long term (i.e., next 50 years). This is the third time this site has changed use in 50 years, so thought should be given to finding a use that will stay
- Keep TREES
- How about reusing existing complex for medical offices or a school?
- Or create a new destination for the mass transit such as a museum
- How does it work with subsidized housing, BMR, etc? Would like to have explanation of how these work.
- No more than 2 –stories along Diablo and Aldean Avenues
- Park sizes are too big – will attract users from all over, creating parking problems
- Buffer parks – where the two neighborhoods can come together
- Distinguish between private space, semi-private space and public space
- Publish groups' comments
- "Put Plans and Comments on WEBSITE"